



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/960,449	09/21/2001	Troy Holland	BioCure 161	5786
44260	7590	10/27/2005	EXAMINER	
LAW OFFICE OF COLLEN A. BEARD, LLC			GHALI, ISIS A D	
P. O. BOX 1064			ART UNIT	
DECATUR, GA 30031-1064			PAPER NUMBER	
			1615	

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/960,449	Applicant(s) HOLLAND ET AL.	
	Examiner Isis Ghali	Art Unit 1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08/05/05.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,8-11,13-17,21-23,25 and 27-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4,8-11,13-17,21-23,25 and 27-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The receipt is acknowledged of applicants' amendment filed 08/05/2005.

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 13-17, 21-23, 25 and 27-29 are included in the prosecution.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 1-4, 8-11, 13-17, 21-23, 25 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The recitation of "the initiator not bound to a macromer or another polymer" has introduced new matter situation that was not described in the specification as originally filed. Nowhere in the specification applicants have disclosed initiator not bound to a macromer or another polymer.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 08/05/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant traverse the new matter rejection by arguing that specification teaches the initiators that is not bound to macromer or any other polymer.

In response to the above argument, and with careful recourse to the specification, the examiner position is that the text of the present specification that applicants are pointing to for support does not support “initiator not bound to the macromer” and does not support “another polymer”, the parts of the specification pointed to by applicants discloses that during the process of making the hydrogel the initiators are added separately in a solution to the macromer and this disclosure does not exclude that the initiators will bound to the macromer later during the process of making or during use. Nowhere applicants have disclosed and support that the hydrogel does not contain initiator that is not bound to the macromer or another polymer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. Claims 1, 2, 8, 9 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,007,833 (833).

The scope of claims 1 and 29 covers liquid composition comprising water soluble PVA having one or more pendant crosslinkable acrylamide groups. The intended use of the composition for spray delivery is not given weight in a claim directed to a composition.

US '833 disclosed a hydrogel wound dressing that is applied to the wound site as a liquid composition and forms flexible polymeric matrix upon exposure to light, i.e. hydrogel formed *in situ* (col.10, lines 1-6). The hydrogel composition comprising crosslinkable macromer includes two or more polymer pendant polymerizable group (abstract). The macromer includes water-soluble polymer, i.e. degradable, as polyvinyl

alcohol; and acrylamide as a pendant polymerizable group (col.5, lines 25-30, 47-53).

Acrylamide groups inherently contain olefinically unsaturated groups. The hydrogel comprises therapeutic agent including growth factor, antimicrobial agent and antithrombotic agent (col.10, lines 11-12, 35-37).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 08/05/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants traverse the above rejection by arguing that US '833 teaches that "preferably, the initiators are bound to the macromer". The reference does not teach the spray delivery of the composition.

In response to the above applicants' arguments, the examiner position is that the reference disclosed the initiator group is present as either a pendent group on a polymerizable macromer, or pendent on separate, non-polymerizable polymer backbone, i.e. not bound to the macromer (col.4, lines 50-53). In addition, at col.6, line 50 and col.15, lines 27-32, the reference disclosed clearly that the initiators could be incorporated in the backbone, and this implies that the initiator can be separate from the macromer backbone, however, as applicants admit, the polymer bond initiators are preferred. The disclosed examples and preferred embodiment of the prior art do not constitute a teaching away from a broader disclosure or nonpreferred embodiments. *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971). In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation of "spray delivery" is not disclosed by the reference, the examiner is pointing out to that the limitation has not been given patentable weight

Art Unit: 1615

because the recitation occurs in the preamble and is directed to the method of using the composition as a spray. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). The recitation of the such intended use in the claim permeable does not limit the scope of the claim since such statement merely define the context in which the invention operates, and the body of the claim defined the subject matter of the claimed invention. The claims are directed to composition, and all the elements of the composition are recited in the body of the claim, and the permeable is not essential to understand limitations or terms in the claim body and does not provide antecedent basis for terms in the body of the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 3, 4, 10, 11, 13-17, 21-23 25, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,007,833 ('833) in view of US 6,179,862 ('682).

US '833 teaches a hydrogel wound dressing that is applied to the wound site as a liquid composition and forms flexible polymeric matrix upon exposure to light, i.e. hydrogel formed *in situ* (col.10, lines 1-6). The hydrogel composition comprising crosslinkable macromer includes two or more polymer pendant polymerizable group (abstract). The macromer includes water-soluble polymer, i.e. degradable, as polyvinyl

alcohol; and acrylamide as a pendant polymerizable group (col.5, lines 25-30, 47-53).

The hydrogel comprises therapeutic agent including growth factor and antimicrobial agent (col.10, lines 11-12).

US '833 does not teach the composition is delivered by spray as claimed in claims 3, 4, 14-17, 21-22. The reference does not teach the active agent as NO as claimed in claims 10 and 23, or the redox irradiation as claimed in claims 13 and 25. The reference does not teach the dressing debrides the wound when removed as claimed in claim 12.

However, US '833 teaches the liquid delivery of the composition without excluding or specifying any method of delivery, thus the spraying the liquid composition into the wound is inclusive in the reference teaching. The reference also teaches the delivery of antithrombotic drugs at the site of application, and this is inclusive to NO, and one having ordinary skill in the art would have determined the antithrombotic agent to use according to the specific patient condition. The reference further teaches the UV irradiation to initiate polymerization. The reference disclosed that the wound dressing formed is very well adheres to the wound site, and it is expected upon its removal to debride the wound.

US '862 disclosed method and composition for forming *in situ* tissue adherent barrier using sprayer to apply cross-linkable two components to the tissue that enable to form coating on the tissue surface (abstract; col.1, lines 48-51, 65-67; col.2, lines 1-8). When the sprayer is activated, the emergent spray contacts tissue, resulting in mixing and cross-linking of the components to form coating, e.g. hydrogel, on the tissue

surface (col.2, lines 5-9). The components are in the form of solution and comprise water-soluble, crosslinkable, biodegradable macromers (col.2, lines 19-34; col.7, lines 24-30). The hydrogel formation is initiated by redox irradiation to form coating (col.4, lines 24-27; col.6, lines 3-5).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a hydrogel composition comprising crosslinkable macromer includes two or more polymer pendant polymerizable group of acrylamide as disclosed by US '833 and deliver the composition by spraying and use redox for crosslinking as disclosed by US '862, motivated by the teaching of US '862 that the spraying on the tissue surface followed by redox irradiation enable to form a wound coating, with reasonable expectation of having a hydrogel composition comprising crosslinkable macromer includes two or more polymer pendant polymerizable group that is delivered from sprayer and polymerized by redox irradiation that enables to protect the wound and initiate wound healing with success.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 03/01/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants traverse the above rejection by arguing that US '833 does not teach the spray deliver, and US ' 862 does not teach the macromer used in the present invention. None of the references teaches the cross-linking initiator not bound to the macromer/polymer. There exists no reason to combine the teachings of the references, and even if they are combined, the claimed invention does not result.

In response to these applicants' arguments, the examiner position is that a conclusion of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) does not require absolute predictability, only a reasonable expectation of success; and references are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosure. *In re Bozek*, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969). US '833 as stated above teaches the initiator can be not bound to the macromer, and US '862 teaches at col.6, lines 3-7 the same initiator system disclosed by the applicants. Further, US '862 disclosed macromers in general, and it is relied upon for teaching the initiator system and the spray delivery recited in the method claim 14. One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In considering the disclosure of the reference, it is proper to take into account not only the specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom. *In re Preda*, 401 F.2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968). The rational to modify or to combine the prior art does not have to be expressly stated in the prior art; the rational may be expressly or impliedly contained in the prior art or it may be reasoned from knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. The reason or motivation to modify the reference may often suggest what the inventor has done, but for a different purpose or to solve different problem. It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination or modification to

achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant. *In re Linter*, 458 F.2d 1013, 173 USPQ 560 (CCPA 1972).

In the light of the foregoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isis Ghali whose telephone number is (571) 272-0595. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00 to 5:30.


Art Unit: 1615

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page can be reached on (571) 272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Isis Ghali
Examiner
Art Unit 1615

IG


THURMAN K. PAGE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600